

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Is this really legal? It seems as if all candidates should be given opportunity, if one is, so close to elections. Did think there were laws making it illegal to air politically oriented "smear" pieces so close to Election Day. Perhaps this is a balanced documentary and another will run on Bush, as well as the other candidates, on all the stations before voting, as this is a public airway for all?
Thank you.